EXHIBIT 1

Case 2:19-cv-10244-PDB-APP ECF No. 1-1 filed 01/24/19 PageID.6 Page 2 of 13

Approved, SCAO	Original - Court 1st copy - Defendant	2nd copy - Plaintiff 3rd copy - Return
STATE OF MICHIGAN		CASE NO.
7th JUDICIAL DISTRICT COUNTY PROBATE	SUMMONS	18CZ
Court address		18 11207
900 S. Saginaw St., Flint, MI 48502		Court telephone no
Plaintiff's name(s), address(es), and telephone JENNISE SAMUELS NOEL	MACARTHU V MACARTHU V OORFORATI	Te(s), address(es), and telephone no(s). JR CORP, and/or MAC ARTHUR ION, and JACK van den BOOGAART,
Plaintiff's attorney, bar no., address, and telepho TOM R. PABST (P27872) 2503 S. LINDEN RD FLINT, MI 48532 (810) 732-6792	one no. MACARTHU c/o Thomas F 3190 Tri Park Grand Blanc,	<mark>. Barrett</mark> Dr
Instructions: Check the items below t along with your complaint and, if neces by the court clerk.	hat apply to you and provide any required inf ssary, a case inventory addendum (form MC 2	formation. Submit this form to the court clerk 21). The summons section will be completed
There is one or more pending or rest the family or family members of the (form MC 21) listing those cases. It is unknown if there are pending or	ases within the jurisdiction of the family divising are the subject of the complaint. solved cases within the jurisdiction of the famperson(s) who are the subject of the complaint resolved cases within the jurisdiction of the person(s) who are the subject of the complaint	nily division of the circuit court involving int. Attached is a completed case inventory
Civil Case This is a business case in which all There is no other pending or resolve complaint.	or part of the action includes a business or c ed civil action arising out of the same transac or other parties arising out of the transaction	ommercial dispute under MCL 600.8035. tion or occurrence as alleged in the
been previously filed in this cou		Court, where
	and assigned to Judge	
The action ☐ remains ☐ is no lon		
Summons section completed by court clerk.		
NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANT: In the 1. You are being sued. 2. YOU HAVE 21 DAYS after receiving	name of the people of the State of Michigan this summons and a copy of the complaint to	file a written answer with the court and
served outside this state).	ke other lawful action with the court (28 diction within the time allowed, judgment may be	ays if you were served by mail or you were
 If you require special accommodation to help you fully participate in court p 	ns to use the court because of a disability or it proceedings, please contact the court immedi	f you require a foreign language interpreter iately to make arrangements.
	MAR 2 1 2019 Court clerk	Tol. 20
This summons is invalid unless served on or bef	ore its expiration date. This document must be sealed b	y the seal of the court

MC 01 (8/18) SUMMONS

MCR 1.109(D), MCR 2.102(B), MCR 2.104, MCR 2.105

Case 2:19-cv-10244-PDB-APP ECF No. 1-1 filed 01/24/19 PageID.7 Page 3 of 13

PROOF OF SERVICE

SUMMONS

Case No. 18-

-CZ

TO PROCESS SERVER: You are to serve the summons and complaint not later than 91 days from the date of filing or the date of expiration on the order for second summons. You must make and file your return with the court clerk. If you are unable to complete service you must return this original and all copies to the court clerk.

				/IT OF	SERVICE / NONSERVICE		
and that: (notar	m a sheriff, dattorney for a rization not requi	a party (MCI red)	f, bailiff, appointed R 2.104[A][2]),	OR			
I served by re	eaistered or a	certified mail	mons and complain I (copy of return recand Exhibit List; Tail I the summons and com	oint att	ached) a copy of the summon	ns and c	omplaint,
Charles a service de la constitución de la constitu				-			
Defendant							on the defendant(s):
Defendant's name			Complete address(es) of servi	ce		Day, date, time
☐ I have persona and have bee	ally attempted	to serve the	summons and com	ıplaint,	together with any attachments	s, on the f	ollowing defendant(s)
Defendant's name			Complete address(es)	of service	е		Day, date, time

l declare under th best of my inform	ne penalties c ation, knowle	of perjury that edge, and be	at this proof of servi elief.	ce has	been examined by me and th	at its co	ntents are true to the
Service fee	Miles traveled	Fee \$,	Signa	ature		
ncorrect address fee	Miles traveled	Fee Is	TOTAL FEE	Nam	e (type or print)		
			\$	Title			
Subscribed and s		Date		1 .			County, Michigan.
My commission ex	xpires:		Signatui	re:	ty court clerk/Notary public		
lotary public, Sta	te of Michiga	n, County o	f				
acknowledge tha	it I have rece	ived service	ACKNOWLEDGM	MENT (DF SERVICE plaint, together with		
	7-27-	N (M)		nu com	plaint, together withAttachmen	ts grant	Der all
	123		Day, date, ti		2012 1 7 200		
ignature			on be	half of			

STATE OF MICHIGAN IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF GENESEE

JENNISE SAMUELS NOEL,

18 112075

CASE NO: 18-

-CZ

Plaintiff,

JUDGE

v.

MACARTHUR CORP and/or MAC ARTHUR CORPORATION, a domestic entity, and JACK van den BOOGAART, individually,

DAVID J. NEWBLATT P-45306

Defendants.

TOM R. PABST (P27872) Attorney for Plaintiff 2503 S. Linden Road Flint, MI 48532 (810) 732-6792



There is no other civil action between these parties arising out of the same transaction or occurrence as alleged in this complaint pending in this court, nor has any such action been previously filed and dismissed or transferred after having been assigned to a judge. I do not know of any other civil action, not between these parties, arising out of the same transaction or occurrence as alleged in this complaint that is either pending or was previously filed and dismissed, transferred, or otherwise disposed of after having been assigned to a judge in this court.

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

NOW COMES Tom R. Pabst, representing Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, and shows unto this Honorable Court as follows:

COMMON ALLEGATIONS

- (1) That at all times pertinent hereto, Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, was/is a resident of Genesee County, Michigan, and was an employee of Defendants herein.
- (2) That at all times pertinent hereto, Defendant Macarthur Corp. and/or Mac Arthur Corporation (hereinafter "Defendant Employer"), was/is, upon information and belief, a Michigan Corporation, providing services in Genesee County, Michigan.

- (3) That at all times pertinent hereto, individual Defendant Jack van den Boogaart, was/is an employee of Defendant Employer, and further, was/is a Vice-President in the company, and as such was/is a person that acts in the interest of Defendant Employer and was a supervisor over Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff.
- (4) That at all times pertinent hereto, Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, was a good and loyal employee of Defendant Employer.
 - (5) That in 2010, Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, was diagnosed with lupus.
- (6) That in 2011, Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, was diagnosed with necrotising miopathy, which required her to receive a 10-hour fusion every other week.
- (7) That Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, did not want to let these diagnoses affect her career, so she requested to work from home on the day of the infusion and the following work day(s) if needed.
- (8) That a prior manager for Defendant Employer reviewed this request and granted it, which allowed Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, to be able to continue working for Defendant Employer.
- (9) That upon information and belief, Defendant Employer was very happy with this arrangement and the work that Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, was producing, as they allowed for this accommodation for approximately 6 years.
- (10) That, upon information and belief, in November of 2016, Defendant van den Boogaart, returned to a position where he had direct supervisory control over Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff's, position.
- (11) That Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, had questioned management for years as to why she was being paid less than other similarly situated employees, and never received an answer. When Defendant van den Boogaart became her supervisor, Plaintiff hoped he could give her an answer, but when she asked him about getting paid equally, he responded by asking her when she would no longer need the accommodation, and that they would further discuss the topic of increasing her pay once the accommodation was completed.
- (12) That on January 10, 2018 Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, gave Defendant Employer notice that she would need to take Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) time off for a series of chemotherapy treatments she had to undergo.
- (13) That the next day, after receiving the notice of Plaintiff's FMLA leave, Defendants provided Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, with a resignation letter, and requested that she sign it.
 - (14) That Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, declined to sign the resignation letter.
- (15) That on January 12, 2018 Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, informed Defendants that she believed she was being treated differently because of her disability and that she was experiencing a hostile work environment.

- (16) That 4 days after making a complaint/opposing the treatment she was experiencing, Defendants accused Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, of an attendance violation for a day the she was authorized to, and was, working from home.
- (17) That the following day, January 17, 2018, Defendants accused Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, of other work/performance violations.
- (18) That on that same day, January 17, 2018, 5 days after she complained about a hostile work environment and discrimination, and days after informing Defendants that she was taking FMLA leave, Defendants denied her request to use earned vacation time because she would not sign the resignation letter.
- (19) That Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, proceeded to take her FMLA leave which was scheduled to run through April 16, 2018, making her return to work date April 17, 2018.
- (20) That Defendants continued to pressure Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, to work while she was taking her FMLA leave.
- (21) That Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, did all of the work that Defendants pressured her into while on her FMLA approved medical leave for chemotherapy treatments.
- (22) That on January 25, 2018, Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, filed a Charge of Discrimination with the Michigan Department of Civil Rights (MDCR).
- (23) That eight (8) days later, on February 2, 2018, Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, received a letter in the mail stating that she "was being terminated from [her] position as a Sales Representative as of April 16, 2018", the day before she returned from her FMLA leave.
- (24) That Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, reached out to Defendant Employer's HR Dept. for clarification, and it was made clear to her that her employment was terminated during her FMLA leave in numerous ways, when she was told:
 - (a) That she was fired on 02/02/2018;
 - (b) That her employment will officially end either when she is cleared or April 16, 2018, whichever comes first;
 - (c) That if she gets a medical extension, she will be fired on the day that extension ends;
 - (d) That if her medical leave turns into an indefinite leave, she will be fired then; and
 - (e) That she should not report back to work
- (25) That the events giving rise to this cause of action occurred in Genesee County, Michigan, making this Court a Court of proper venue to file this lawsuit. 29 USC 2617(a)(2).

COUNT I FAMILY MEDICAL LEAVE ACT INTERFERENCE

(26) That we repeat \P s 1-25.

- (27) This is an action for violations of the Family Medical Leave Act of 1993 ("FMLA"), 29 USC 2601 et seq.
- (28) That this State of Michigan Circuit Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 29 USC 2617(a)(2).
- (29) That Plaintiff is a citizen of the United States, and the State of Michigan, and resides in Genesee County.
- (30) That Defendant Employer is a business which provides services in Genesee County, Michigan.
 - (31) That Plaintiff is an eligible employee as defined by the FMLA.
 - (32) That Defendant Employer is an employer as defined by the FMLA.
- (33) That the individual Defendants are each a person that acts in the interest of the Employer. See, for example, 29 CFR 825.104(a).
- (34) That the events giving rise to this cause of action occurred within Genesee County.
- (35) That Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, became employed with Defendant Employer on or about July of 2005.
- (36) That Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, properly sought FMLA leave to obtain treatment for a serious health condition as defined by the FMLA. See, for example, 29 USC 26.2(a)(1); 29 CFR 825.112(a)(4) .200(a)(4); 29 CFR 825.115.
- (37) That Plaintiff notified her employer of her need to take time off for treatment and her request was approved.
- (38) That upon her attempt to return to work, Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, was informed by Defendants that she was fired and not to return to work.
- (39) That in willfully failing to restore Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, to her previous position or an equivalent position with equivalent employment benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment, Defendants, each and/or all of them, violated Plaintiff's rights under the FMLA. 29 USC 2601 et seq.
- (40) That Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment before the expiration of her FMLA leave.
- (41) That Defendants' conduct, by and through its agents, servants or employees, in violation of the FMLA, was also "willful", as that term in used under the FMLA law. 29 CFR 825.400.

- (42) That Defendants' conduct, by and through its agents, servants or employees, violated Plaintiff's rights under the FMLA, 29 USC 2601 et seq.
- (43) That at all relevant times the Defendants interfered with, restrained or denied the exercise of rights under the FMLA against Plaintiff and, further, discriminated against the Plaintiff in violation of the FMLA.
- (44) That as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, has suffered loss of wages, benefits and loss of employment opportunities.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendants, as follows:

Legal Relief

- (a) Compensatory damages in whatever amount she is found to be entitled;
- (b) Liquidated damages in whatever amount she is found to be entitled:
- (c) An award of interest, costs and reasonable attorney fees and expert witness fees;

Equitable Relief

- (a) An Order reinstating Plaintiff to an appropriate position with Defendants;
- (b) An injunction prohibiting any further acts of wrongdoing, discrimination or retaliation; and
- (c) Whatever other equitable relief appears appropriate at the time of final judgment.

COUNT II FAMILY MEDICAL LEAVE ACT RETALIATION

- (45) That we repeat \P s 1-44.
- (46) That at all relevant times the Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff, who (a) opposed practices made unlawful by the FMLA and/or who (b) participated in any proceeding related to the enforcement of the FMLA, by actions including, but not necessarily limited to, failing to restore Plaintiff to her previous position, or an equivalent position with equivalent employment benefits, pay and other terms and conditions of employment, and/or by terminating her employment.
 - (47) That Defendants' violations of the FMLA was/were willful. 29 CFR 825.400.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendants, as follows:

Legal Relief

- (a) Compensatory damages in whatever amount she is found to be entitled;
- (b) Liquidated damages in whatever amount she is found to be entitled;
- (c) An award of interest, costs and reasonable attorney fees and expert witness fees;

Equitable Relief

- (a) An Order reinstating Plaintiff to an appropriate position with Defendants;
- (b) An injunction prohibiting any further acts of wrongdoing, discrimination or retaliation; and
- (c) Whatever other equitable relief appears appropriate at the time of final judgment.

COUNT III ADA & ADAAA VIOLATIONS (DEFENDANT EMPLOYER ONLY)

- (48) That we repeat paragraphs 1-47.
- (49) That Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, has civil rights under the Federal ADA, being 42 USC §12101, et. seq. as amended by the ADA Amendments Act of 2008, and as bolstered by 42 USC §2000e, et. seq., and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, being 42 USC §1981a and 42 USC §1988.
- (50) That Defendant Employer violated the aforesaid law, which violations included, but not by way of limitation, the following acts and/or omissions:
 - (a) "Harassing" of Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff;
 - (b) "Perceiving" and/or "regarding" Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, as "disabled", and based on Defendants' wrongful perception, denying her work and/or employment opportunities; and
 - (c) Failing to "accommodate" Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, if she was in fact disabled as Defendants claimed.

all of which violated Jennise Samuels Noel's rights under 42 USC §12101, et. seq.

(51) That specifically, but not by way of limitation, Defendants herein-

- (a) Refused to honor doctor-imposed limitations/restrictions for Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff;
- (b) Refused to "accommodate" Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff; and
- (c) Refused to place Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, into available jobs she was capable of doing

all of which violated Jennise Samuels Noel's rights under 42 USC §12101, et. seq.

- (52) That Defendant Employer herein in fact fired Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, in violation of 42 USC §12101, et. seq.
- (53) That as a direct and proximate result thereof, Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, suffered the following injuries and damages, amongst others--
 - (a) loss of her job;
 - (b) lost wages, past and future;
 - (c) loss of earning capacity;
 - (d) emotional distress and mental anguish, past and future;
 - (e) injury to her feelings, including extreme embarrassment and humiliation, past and future;
 - (f) damage to her reputation, past and future;
 - (g) outrage;
 - (h) incurrence of actual attorney's fees and costs for having to enforce her legal rights and vindicate herself for the wrongful misconduct of Defendants herein; and
 - (i) other injuries and damages, the exact nature and extent of which are not now known.
- (54) That the Right-to-Sue letters issued to Jennise Samuels Noel, Plaintiff, are attached hereto as Ex. 1 and by this reference incorporated herein.
- (55) That the monetary damages caused by Defendants' unlawful conduct far exceed One Hundred Thousand (\$100,000.00) Dollars.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendants, as follows:

Legal Relief

- (a) Compensatory damages in whatever amount she is found to be entitled;
- (b) Liquidated damages in whatever amount she is found to be entitled;
- (c) Punitive damages in whatever amount she is found to be entitled to and available under applicable Federal Law, if any;
- (d) An award of interest, costs and reasonable attorney fees and expert witness fees;

Equitable Relief

- (a) An Order reinstating Plaintiff to an appropriate position with Defendants;
- (b) An injunction prohibiting any further acts of wrongdoing, discrimination or retailiation; and
- (c) Whatever other equitable relief appears appropriate at the time of final judgment.

12-20-18

DATE

TOM R. PABST (P27872)
Representing Plaintiff

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

12-20-18

DATE

TOM R. PABST (P27872)
Representing Plaintiff

8

EEO/C Fg 1931.8 (47/16)	U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMM	
220070	NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON RE	EQUEST)
To Jennise Samuels N 6075 Davison Rd Burton, MI 48509	Noel From: Det 477 Roc	troit Field Office 7 Michigan Avenue om 865 troit, MI 48226
On behalf of CONFIDENT	person(s) aggrieved whose identity is TIAL (29 CFR §1601 7(3))	
EEOC Charge No.	EEOC Representative	Telephone No
•	Antoinette Coburn, State/Local Coordinator	(313) 226-4637
23A-2018-10182	(See also the a	additional information enclosed with this form)
of your receipt of this n state law may be differen	180 days have passed since the filing of this charge.	ime limit for filing suit based on a claim under
be able to	complete its administrative processing within 180 days from the filir c is terminating its processing of this charge	ng of this charge.
Age Discrimination in E	C will continue to process this charge. Employment Act (ADEA): You may sue under the ADEA at any time e notice that we have completed action on the charge. In this regard	ne from 60 days after the charge was filed until rd, the paragraph marked below applies to
90 DAYS	C is closing your case. Therefore, your lawsuit under the ADEA mu of your receipt of this Notice. Otherwise, your right to sue based	
you may f	C is continuing its handling of your ADEA case. However, if 60 days ile suit in federal or state court under the ADEA at this time.	
Equal Pay Act (EPA): Y in federal or state court w any violations that occ	You already have the right to sue under the EPA (filing an EEOC char within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the alleged EPA underp curred <u>more than 2 years (3 years)</u> before you file suit may not b	rge is not required.) EPA suits must be brought payment. This means that backpay due for be collectible.
If you file suit, based on t	this charge, please send a copy of your court complaint to this office.	
	On behalf of the Commis	
	Michelle Excel	0
	Markey Dash	11/28/18
Enclosures(s)	Michelle Eisele, District Director	(Date Mailed)

MacArthur Corporation Katherine J. Van Dyke 2000 Town Center, Suite 1650 Southfield, MI 48075

CC

EECC Form 161-B	(11/16) U.S. E	QUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION	
	Notici	E OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUES	ST)
6075 D	e Samuels Noel avison Road I, MI 48509	From: Detroit Fiel 477 Michig Room 865 Detroit, MI	d Office an Avenue
	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601)	7(a))	Telephone No
EEOC Charge	No.	EEOC Representative	relephone No.
		Antoinette Coburn, State/Local Coordinator	(313) 226-4637
23A-2018-1	10010	State/Local Coordinator	I information enclosed with this form.)
Marior 20 7:	PERSON AGGRIEVED:		
Act (GINA): 1 been issued a of your recei	This is your Notice of Right to S	te Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or the Gene Sue, issued under Title VII, the ADA or GINA based on tr under Title VII, the ADA or GINA must be filed in a feder to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The time limit	ral or state court WITHIN 90 DAYS
X	More than 180 days have pas	ssed since the filing of this charge.	
	Lara than 100 days house one	ised since the filing of this charge, but I have determined histrative processing within 180 days from the filing of this	that it is unlikely that the EEOC will charge.
X	The EEOC is terminating its p		
	The EEOC will continue to pr	ocess this charge.	
Age Discrim 90 days after your case:	r you receive notice that we have	ADEA): You may sue under the ADEA at any time from the completed action on the charge. In this regard, the page of	
	The EEOC is closing your ca 90 DAYS of your receipt of	ise. Therefore, your lawsuit under the ADEA must be fill this Notice. Otherwise, your right to sue based on the a	ed in federal or state court <u>WITHIN</u> above-numbered charge will be lost.
	The EEOC is continuing its h you may file suit in federal or	nandling of your ADEA case. However, if 60 days have postate court under the ADEA at this time.	assed since the filing of the charge,
		e right to sue under the EPA (filing an EEOC charge is no ars for willful violations) of the alleged EPA underpayment. 2 years (3 years) before you file suit may not be colle	
If you file suit	t, based on this charge, please	send a copy of your court complaint to this office.	
		On behalf of the Commission	
		Midelle Esele	11/28/18
Enclosures	(\$)	Michelle Eisele, District Director	(Date Mailed)
CC:			

MacArthur Corporation Katherine J. Van Dyke 2000 Town Center Suite 1650 Southfield, MI 48075